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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 20   | • Do you think using the pre-acquisition headroom (PH) approach could improve the effectiveness of impairment test?  
      • Do you have any comments or suggestions on improving the mechanics of the PH approach? |
| 28   | • Do you think using a single method, ie FVLCD or VIU, to determine recoverable amount could improve the effectiveness of impairment test?  
      • If in most of the situations, FVLCD and VIU measurements do not produce significantly different values, is there a need for higher of the two approach for determining recoverable amount? |
Introduction

Goodwill and Impairment research project
Objectives of the research project

Whether it is possible to:

- Improve the quality of information provided to users without imposing costs that outweigh benefits
- Simplify and improve application of impairment test without loss of information to investors
- Simplify separation of specified identifiable intangible assets from goodwill in a business combination
Objective of this session

Whether it is possible to:

- Improve the quality of information provided to users without imposing costs that outweigh benefits
- Simplify and improve application of impairment test without loss of information to investors
- Simplify separation of specified identifiable intangible assets from goodwill in a business combination
Why improve the impairment test?

**IAS 36 requirements**
- Goodwill is not amortised
- Quantitative impairment testing annually and whenever there is an indication of impairment
- Recoverable amount* to be calculated every year

**Users’ concerns**
- Entity-specific nature of VIU and scope for passing the impairment test
- Delays in the timing and amount of impairment loss (‘too little too late’ issue)

**Ongoing research**
- Shielding effect of internally generated goodwill identified as one of the causes of ‘too little too late’ issue
- Considering measures to remove the shielding effect
- Using a single method for determining recoverable amount instead of higher of the two

* Recoverable amount is higher of fair value less costs of disposal (FVLCD) and value in use (VIU)
Feedback from previous discussions with ASAF
## Feedback from previous discussions with ASAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Questions asked</th>
<th>Summary of feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| December 2015 | ASAF members were asked for feedback on the Board’s initial discussions and for any advice on the way forward with the project. | • Mixed views with some members supporting impairment-only approach to goodwill whereas others supported amortisation and impairment of goodwill.  
• Consider what information users want; focus on the benefits for users of the current information versus the costs to preparers of applying the requirements.  
• Focus primarily on improving the impairment test, because such an improvement would be required regardless of the approach for accounting for goodwill.  
• Some ASAF members thought it necessary to retain a robust impairment test if the impairment-only approach is maintained. |

Click the links for full [meeting summary](#) and [recording](#).
## Feedback from previous discussions with ASAF (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Questions asked</th>
<th>Summary of feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| July 2016 | ASAF members were asked for views on the quantitative study presented by staff of EFRAG and ASBJ staff on trends in goodwill, intangible assets and impairment charges over ten years. | Some ASAF members:  
• suggested the objective and research question need to be specified clearly.  
• questioned whether the study provides sufficient information about internally generated intangible assets.  
• emphasized that it is difficult to analyse goodwill on an average basis because goodwill is concentrated among a small number of companies.  
• suggested reviewing goodwill on a case by case basis and performing further analysis of goodwill by industry.  
Click the links for full meeting summary and recording. |
### Feedback from previous discussions with ASAF (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Questions asked</th>
<th>Summary of feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2017</td>
<td>ASAF members were asked for feedback on the IASB staff’s and ASBJ’s current thoughts on simplifying and improving the effectiveness of the impairment testing model for goodwill.</td>
<td>• ASAF members generally did not support the ASBJ’s idea of allowing a choice between amortisation and impairment model and impairment-only model mainly because of deteriorating comparability and other concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mixed views on single method approach and indicator-only approach to simplify and improve goodwill impairment testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Click the links for <a href="#">agenda papers 3–3B</a> and <a href="#">recording</a>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The pre-acquisition headroom approach

See paragraphs 25–27 and Appendices A and B of Agenda Paper 18D of the July 2017 Board meeting
Possible scenarios in an acquisition

Case 1

Before acquisition:
Entity E acquires Entity C

After acquisition:
Entity E
CGU A
CGU B
CGU C

Case 2

Before acquisition:
Entity E acquires Entity C

After acquisition:
Entity E
CGU A
CGU B
CGU BC

See paragraphs 25–27 and Appendices A and B of Agenda Paper 18D of the July 2017 Board meeting
What is the shielding effect?

Case 1

• Entity C is a separate CGU
• Assume that all of the purchased goodwill is allocated to that CGU
• There are no pre-acquisition unrecognised internally generated assets or goodwill that shield the purchased goodwill
• Arguably, newly internally generated goodwill of CGU C shields the purchased goodwill from impairment

Case 2

• Entity C is not a separate CGU
• Existing CGU B and Entity C are grouped as a single CGU BC to which all of the purchased goodwill is allocated
• The new CGU BC includes the pre-acquisition unrecognised internally generated assets and goodwill (pre-acquisition headroom or PH), if any, of CGU B
• That PH of CGU B shields the purchased goodwill by absorbing any negative movements in the recoverable amount of the new CGU BC
• Arguably, newly internally generated goodwill of CGU BC also shields the purchased goodwill

See paragraphs 25–27 and Appendices A and B of Agenda Paper 18D of the July 2017 Board meeting.
How does the PH approach work?

- PH approach aims to prevent the shielding effect of pre-acquisition internally generated goodwill or assets of existing CGUs

- Basic mechanics of the PH approach:
  1. Measure the PH of CGU B immediately before the acquisition (the PH is never recognised in the financial statements)
  2. The PH is added to the carrying amount of CGU BC every time CGU BC is tested for impairment (PH is included only for impairment testing)
  3. Compare the carrying amount (including the PH) with the recoverable amount of CGU BC in calculating impairment loss, if any

See paragraphs 25–27 and Appendices A and B of Agenda Paper 18D of the July 2017 Board meeting
Application of PH approach—Year 1

Pre-acquisition

Carrying amount of CGU B

Carrying amount of CGU B

Recoverable amount of CGU B

Post-acquisition

Carrying amount of CGU BC

Carrying amount of CGU BC

Acquired net assets

Good will

Impairment test applying PH approach

Carrying amount of CGU BC + PH

Carrying amount of other net assets

Good will

Carrying amount of other net assets

Recoverable amount of CGU BC

No impairment

Carrying amount of CGU BC

Carrying amount of other net assets

Good will

PH

See paragraphs 25–27 and Appendices A and B of Agenda Paper 18D of the July 2017 Board meeting
Application of PH approach—Year 2

See paragraphs 25–27 and Appendices A and B of Agenda Paper 18D of the July 2017 Board meeting.
Application of PH approach—Year 3

Carried over from acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carrying amount of CGU BC + PH</th>
<th>Carrying amount of other net assets</th>
<th>Carrying amount of other net assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>GW</td>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impairment test applying PH approach

- Carrying amount of CGU BC
- PH
- GW

Impairment recognised

Recoverable amount of CGU BC

Carrying amount after impairment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carrying amount of CGU BC</th>
<th>Carrying amount of other net assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>GW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See paragraphs 25–27 and Appendices A and B of Agenda Paper 18D of the July 2017 Board meeting
Application of PH approach—Year 4

Carried over from acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carrying amount of CGU BC + PH</th>
<th>GW</th>
<th>Carrying amount of other net assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrying amount of CGU BC</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impairment test applying PH approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recoverable amount of CGU BC</th>
<th>Impairment recognised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrying amount of other net assets</td>
<td>Impairment not recognised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carrying amount after impairment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carrying amount of CGU BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

See paragraphs 25–27 and Appendices A and B of Agenda Paper 18D of the July 2017 Board meeting.
### Pros and Cons of the PH approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Leads to earlier recognition of impairment losses</td>
<td>• As the PH is determined on acquisition and not updated after acquisition, the approach cannot remove any increase in the shielding effect of newly generated goodwill after acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Measurement of the PH would be a one-off cost at the time of acquisition</td>
<td>• It adds complexity to the impairment test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will be most effective in the first impairment test after an acquisition because this test will be performed soon after the PH is measured</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See paragraphs 25–27 and Appendices A and B of [Agenda Paper 18D](#) of the July 2017 Board meeting.
Questions to ASAF members

- Do you think using the PH approach could improve the effectiveness of impairment test?
- Do you have any comments or suggestions on improving the mechanics of the PH approach?

See paragraphs 25–27 and Appendices A and B of Agenda Paper 18D of the July 2017 Board meeting.
Single method for determining the recoverable amount

Briefly discussed by ASAF at its July 2017 meeting
Staff current thoughts—single method

| FVLCD as the sole basis | OR | VIU as the sole basis | OR | FVLCD or VIU depending on how an entity expects to recover the asset |

Single method for determining recoverable amount instead of higher of the two
### Staff current thoughts—single method

(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback from a few users</th>
<th>concerned about entity-specific nature of VIU and scope for management to pass the impairment test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a fair value based impairment model would be more objective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback from a few preparers</th>
<th>VIU better reflects the fact that an entity holds the assets for continued use in the business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Like FVLCD, VIU is a reflection of range of economic conditions and not just the best case scenario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other feedback</th>
<th>a few auditors concerned about the difficulty in challenging management’s best estimates used in VIU calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Using a single method might improve effectiveness of the test and could:</th>
<th>make the test easier to apply and understand; and</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reduce concerns that current model makes it easy to delay and (or) conceal impairment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Do VIU and FVLCD approximate each other?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VIU calculation</th>
<th>FVLCD calculation</th>
<th>Staff current thoughts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall approach</strong></td>
<td>Management’s best estimates</td>
<td>Level 3 inputs</td>
<td>Level 3 inputs may not be significantly different from management’s best estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valuation model</strong></td>
<td>Discounted cash flow</td>
<td>Generally based on discounted cash flow techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash flow projections</strong></td>
<td>• Reasonable and supportable assumptions and giving greater weight to external evidence</td>
<td>All future cash flow projected using best available information, which might include entity’s own data, and taking into account reasonably available market participant assumptions</td>
<td>• The cash flow projections are not likely to be different except for the cash flows prohibited in VIU calculation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prohibition on including cash flows from expected future restructurings or from improving or enhancing the asset’s performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholders’ requests for removing the prohibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In practice, it is unclear whether the prohibitions create a difference between FVLCD and VIU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do VIU and FVLCD approximate each other? (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VIU calculation</th>
<th>FVLCD calculation</th>
<th>Staff current thoughts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discount rate</strong></td>
<td>• IAS 36 requires the use of a pre-tax discount rate</td>
<td>A post-tax discount rate is generally used</td>
<td>In practice, the same discount rate is used for both VIU and FVLCD calculations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stakeholders’ feedback that pre-tax discount rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is not meaningful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entity-specific</strong></td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Not included</td>
<td>• Arguably, any synergies considered in VIU but not in FVLCD calculation could raise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>specific</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>questions on identification of the unit of account [CGU(s)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• FVLCD calculation assumes availability of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>synergies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– any complementary assets and associated liabilities; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– synergies from using assets as a group in an ongoing business to market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do VIU and FVLCD approximate each other? (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VIU calculation</th>
<th>FVLCD calculation</th>
<th>Staff current thoughts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costs of disposal</td>
<td>Considered and are discounted because the asset is assumed to be sold in the future, possibly at the end of its useful life</td>
<td>Considered but are not discounted because the asset is assumed to be sold immediately</td>
<td>At the point at which an entity decides to dispose of the asset, costs to sell do not create any difference between the two amounts and VIU and FV are very likely to be equal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback from ASAF in July 2017

- In considering the single method, consider the possible effect on other non-current assets within the scope of IAS 36
- No enough evidence on whether there are significant differences in practice between VIU and FVLCD
- VIU better reflects the value of assets that an entity plans to use in its business and may not be any less objective than Level 3 FV
- Some industries prefer the use of FVLCD because of the prohibition on specified cash flows to be used in VIU calculation
• Do you think using a single method, ie FVLCD or VIU, to determine recoverable amount could improve the effectiveness of impairment test?

• If in most of the situations, FVLCD and VIU measurements do not produce significantly different values, is there a need for higher of the two approach for determining recoverable amount?
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